

PROPOSITION **73** | **Waiting Period and Parental Notification Before Termination of Minor's Pregnancy. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.**

**SUMMARY**

Amends California Constitution, defining and prohibiting abortion for unemancipated minor until 48 hours after physician notifies minor's parent/guardian, except in medical emergency or with parental waiver. Mandates reporting requirements. Authorizes monetary damages against physicians for violation. Fiscal Impact: Potential unknown net state costs of several million dollars annually for health and social services programs, the courts, and state administration combined.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**

A YES vote on this measure means: The California Constitution would be changed to require that a physician notify, with certain exceptions, a parent or legal guardian of a pregnant minor at least 48 hours before performing an abortion.

**NO**

A NO vote on this measure means: Minors would continue to receive abortion services to the same extent as adults. Physicians performing abortions for minors would not be subject to notification requirements.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

*MORE THAN ONE MILLION CALIFORNIANS' signatures qualified PROPOSITION 73! It will RESTORE Californians' right to counsel and care for their young daughters before—and after—an abortion. Similar laws are protecting girls in over thirty states. FOR OUR DAUGHTERS' SAFETY, HEALTH, AND PROTECTION, VOTE YES on 73!*

**CON**

Prop. 73 says government can mandate family communication. It can't. Scared, pregnant teenagers don't need a judge—they need a counselor. Vulnerable teenagers who can't talk to their parents may resort to unsafe, illegal abortions. Parents rightly want to know, but keeping teens safe is even more important.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**

YES on 73 / Parents' Right to Know and Child Protection  
2555 Rio De Oro Way  
Sacramento, CA 95826  
Toll-Free (866) 828-8355  
Janet@YESon73.net  
www.YESon73.net

**AGAINST**

Steve Smith  
Campaign for Teen Safety  
555 Capitol Mall, Suite 510  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 669-4802  
info@noonproposition73.org  
www.NoOnProposition73.org

PROPOSITION **74** | **Public School Teachers. Waiting Period for Permanent Status. Dismissal. Initiative Statute.**

**SUMMARY**

Increases probationary period for public school teachers from two to five years. Modifies the process by which school boards can dismiss a teaching employee who receives two consecutive unsatisfactory performance evaluations. Fiscal Impact: Unknown net effect on school districts' costs for teacher compensation, performance evaluations, and other activities. Impact would vary significantly by district and depend largely on future district personnel actions.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**

A YES vote on this measure means: The probationary period for new teachers would be extended from two to five years, and school districts could dismiss permanent teachers who received two consecutive unsatisfactory performance evaluations using a modified dismissal process.

**NO**

A NO vote on this measure means: The probationary period for new teachers would remain two years, and no changes would be made to the dismissal process for permanent teachers.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

Proposition 74 is Real Education Reform—ensuring our children have high-quality teachers. YES on 74 changes tenure eligibility from 2 years to 5 years. YES on 74 rewards good teachers, but weeds out problem teachers. YES on 74—Improve education, ensure our children get the best possible teachers.

**CON**

Prop. 74 won't improve student achievement, punishes hardworking teachers, and ignores our schools' real problems. California's teachers can be and are fired. They're not guaranteed a life-time job, just a hearing before dismissal—this initiative revokes that right for many. Prop. 74 discourages recruitment of quality teachers we desperately need.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**

Governor Schwarzenegger's California Recovery Team  
310 Main Street, Suite 225  
Santa Monica, CA 90405  
Joinarnold.com

**AGAINST**

Andrea Landis  
No on 74, a Coalition of Teachers and School Board Members for Quality Teaching and Learning  
1510 J Street, Suite 210  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 443-7817  
info@noonproposition74.com  
www.noonproposition74.com

PROPOSITION **75** | **Public Employee Union Dues. Restrictions on Political Contributions. Employee Consent Requirement. Initiative Statute.**

**SUMMARY**

Prohibits using public employee union dues for political contributions without individual employees' prior consent. Excludes contributions benefitting charities or employees. Requires unions to maintain and, upon request, report member political contributions to Fair Political Practices Commission. Fiscal Impact: Probably minor state and local government implementation costs, potentially offset in part by revenues from fines and/or fees.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**  
**YES**

A YES vote on this measure means: Public employee unions would be required to get annual, written consent from government employee union members and nonmembers to charge and use any dues or fees for political purposes.

**NO**

A NO vote on this measure means: Public employee unions could charge and use dues or fees for political purposes without annual, written consent. Fees from a nonmember of a union could not be spent on political purposes if the nonmember objects.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

Proposition 75 protects public employee union members from having political contributions made from their dues without their annual permission. Currently public employee union members are *forced to contribute* their hard earned money to political candidates or issues they may oppose. Yes on Proposition 75 will make those contributions clearly voluntary.

**CON**

Prop. 75 is unfair to teachers, nurses, police, and firefighters. It makes their labor unions play by different rules than big corporations. It's unnecessary. The U.S. Supreme Court says no public employee can be forced to join a union and contribute to politics. It's sponsored by corporations who oppose unions.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**

Californians for  
Paycheck Protection  
1500 W. El Camino Ave. #113  
Sacramento, CA 95833  
(916) 786-8163  
info@caforpaycheck  
protection.com  
www.caforpaycheck  
protection.com

**AGAINST**

Shawnda Westly  
The Strategy Group  
35 S. Raymond Ave. #405  
Pasadena, CA 91105  
(626) 535-0710  
info@prop75No.com  
www.prop75No.com

PROPOSITION **76** | **State Spending and School Funding Limits. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.**

**SUMMARY**

Limits state spending to prior year's level plus three previous years' average revenue growth. Changes minimum school funding requirements (Proposition 98). Permits Governor, under specified circumstances, to reduce budget appropriations of Governor's choosing. Fiscal Impact: State spending likely reduced relative to current law, due to additional spending limit and new powers granted to Governor. Reductions could apply to schools and shift costs to other local governments.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**  
**YES**

A YES vote on this measure means: State expenditures would be subject to an additional spending limit based on an average of recent revenue growth. The Governor would be granted new authority to unilaterally reduce state spending during certain fiscal situations. School and community college spending would be more subject to annual budget decisions and less affected by a constitutional funding guarantee.

**NO**

A NO vote on this measure means: The state would not adopt an additional spending limit, the Governor would not be granted new powers to reduce state spending during certain fiscal situations, and existing constitutional provisions relating to schools and community college funding would not be changed.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

PROPOSITION 76 CONTROLS STATE SPENDING AND FIXES CALIFORNIA'S BROKEN BUDGET SYSTEM. Yes on 76 protects against future deficits and eliminates wasteful spending, making more money available for roads, healthcare, and law enforcement without raising taxes. It establishes "checks and balances," encouraging bipartisan budget solutions —YES on Prop. 76.

**CON**

Prop. 76 cuts school funding by \$4 billion, overturns voter-approved school funding guarantees, and gives the governor unchecked power over state budget, destroying our system of checks and balances. Does nothing to prevent new taxes. Endangers local funding for police, fire and health care, including trauma centers and child immunization.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**

Governor Schwarzenegger's  
California Recovery Team  
310 Main Street, Suite 225  
Santa Monica, CA 90405  
Joinarnold.com

**AGAINST**

Andrea Landis  
No on 76, Coalition of  
educators, firefighters, school  
employees, health care givers  
and labor organizations  
1510 J Street, Suite 210  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 443-7817  
info@noonproposition76.com  
www.noonproposition76.com

PROPOSITION **77** | **Redistricting.  
Initiative Constitutional Amendment.**

**SUMMARY**

Amends state Constitution's process for redistricting California's Senate, Assembly, Congressional and Board of Equalization districts. Requires three-member panel of retired judges selected by legislative leaders. Fiscal Impact: One-time state redistricting costs totaling no more than \$1.5 million and county costs in the range of \$1 million. Potential reduction in future costs, but net impact would depend on decisions by voters.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**

A YES vote on this measure means: Boundaries for political districts would be drawn by retired judges and approved by voters at statewide elections. A redistricting plan would be developed for use following the measure's approval and then following each future federal census.

**NO**

A NO vote on this measure means: Boundaries for political districts would continue to be drawn by the Legislature and approved by the Governor. A redistricting plan would be developed following each future federal census.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

**PROPOSITION 77 MAKES POLITICIANS ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PEOPLE.** Yes on Prop. 77 guarantees fair, competitive elections by ensuring voters have the final say on voting districts—not politicians. Prop. 77 reduces special interest influence and holds politicians accountable to their constituents. Fair Districts, Real Competition—Yes on 77.

**CON**

Sponsors want you to believe Prop. 77 makes government better. Don't be fooled! *Read the fine print: Voters lose their right to reject redistricting before it becomes effective; politicians pick judges to draw districts for them; it costs taxpayers millions; and is cemented into our Constitution.* Vote No on 77!

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**

Edward J. Costa  
People's Advocate  
3407 Arden Way  
Sacramento, CA 95825  
(916) 482-6175  
emily@peoplesadvocate.org

**AGAINST**

Californians for Fair Representation—No on 77  
1127 11th Street, Suite 950  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 448-7724  
www.noonproposition77.com

PROPOSITION **78** | **Discounts on Prescription Drugs.  
Initiative Statute.**

**SUMMARY**

Establishes discount prescription drug program for certain low- and moderate-income Californians. Authorizes Department of Health Services to contract with participating pharmacies for discounts and with participating drug manufacturers for rebates. Fiscal Impact: State costs for administration and outreach in the millions to low tens of millions of dollars annually. State costs for advance funding for rebates. Unknown potentially significant savings for state and county health programs.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**

A YES vote on this measure means: A new state drug discount program would be created to reduce the costs that certain residents of the state, including persons in families with an income at or below 300 percent of the federal poverty level, would pay for prescription drugs purchased at pharmacies.

**NO**

A NO vote on this measure means: The state would not expand its drug discount program beyond an existing state program that assists elderly and disabled persons on Medicare.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

Proposition 78 provides that millions of seniors and low income, uninsured Californians can buy prescription drugs at discounts of 40%. Adapted from a successful program operating in Ohio, Prop. 78 can take effect immediately without a big government bureaucracy. Seniors, taxpayers, nurses, doctors, and patient advocates say Yes on Proposition 78. [www.calrxnow.org](http://www.calrxnow.org)

**CON**

**SPONSORED BY THE PRESCRIPTION DRUG COMPANIES,** Prop. 78 is a SMOKESCREEN to stop Prop. 79, a real, enforceable plan backed by consumer groups. Under the "voluntary" Prop. 78, drug companies don't have to provide a single discount, and the plan can END AT ANY TIME. VOTE NO on Prop. 78.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**

Californians for Affordable Prescriptions  
1415 L Street, Suite 1250  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
info@calrxnow.org  
www.calrxnow.org

**AGAINST**

Anthony Wright  
Health Access California  
414 13th Street, Suite 450  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(510) 873-8787  
awright@health-access.org  
www.VoteNoOnProp78.com

**PROPOSITION** | **Prescription Drug Discounts.  
State-Negotiated Rebates.  
Initiative Statute.**

**79**

**SUMMARY**

Provides drug discounts to Californians with qualifying incomes. Funded by state-negotiated drug manufacturer rebates. Prohibits Medi-Cal contracts with manufacturers not providing Medicaid best price. Fiscal Impact: State costs for administration and outreach in low tens of millions of dollars annually. State costs for advance funding for rebates. Unknown potentially significant: (1) net costs or savings for Medi-Cal and (2) savings for state and county health programs.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**

A YES vote on this measure means: A new state drug discount program would be created to reduce the costs that certain residents of the state, including persons in families with an income at or below 400 percent of the federal poverty level, would pay for prescription drugs purchased at pharmacies. The new program would be linked to Medi-Cal for the purpose of obtaining rebates on drugs.

**NO**

A NO vote on this measure means: The state would not expand its drug discount program beyond an existing state program that assists elderly and disabled persons on Medicare.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

Prop. 79 provides ENFORCEABLE discounts on prescription drugs for millions of Californians. Prop. 79 provides DEEPER DISCOUNTS TO MORE PEOPLE than the drug industry's "voluntary" Prop. 78. Prop. 79 saves taxpayers money by reducing prescription drug costs. JOIN CONSUMER, HEALTH, AND SENIOR CITIZEN ADVOCATES and VOTE YES on Prop. 79.

**CON**

Proposition 79 can't deliver what it promises. It's based on a failed program from Maine that never took effect. Prop. 79 won't receive federal approval because it threatens poor patients' access to needed drugs. Proposition 79 creates a big government bureaucracy costing millions. Worse, trial lawyers can file thousands of frivolous lawsuits. [www.calrxnow.org](http://www.calrxnow.org)

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**

Anthony Wright  
Health Access California  
414 13th Street, Suite 450  
Oakland, CA 94612  
(510) 873-8787  
[awright@health-access.org](mailto:awright@health-access.org)  
[www.VoteYesOnProp79.com](http://www.VoteYesOnProp79.com)

**AGAINST**

Californians Against  
the Wrong Prescription  
1415 L Street, Suite 1250  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
[info@calrxnow.org](mailto:info@calrxnow.org)  
[www.calrxnow.org](http://www.calrxnow.org)

**PROPOSITION** | **Electric Service Providers.  
Regulation.  
Initiative Statute.**

**80**

**SUMMARY**

Subjects electric service providers to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission. Restricts electricity customers' ability to switch from private utilities to other providers. Requires all retail electric sellers to increase renewable energy resource procurement by 2010. Fiscal Impact: Potential annual administrative costs ranging from negligible to \$4 million, paid by fees. Unknown net impact on state and local costs and revenues from uncertain impact on electricity rates.

**WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS**

**YES**

A YES vote on this measure means: The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) would have broadened authority to regulate electric service providers. The PUC's current policies related to the electricity procurement process, resource adequacy requirements, and the renewables portfolio standard would be put into law. Small electricity customers in existing buildings could not be required to accept time-differentiated electricity rates without their consent. The current prohibition on new "direct access" for electricity service would be continued beyond 2015.

**NO**

A NO vote on this measure means: The PUC would not have broadened authority to regulate electric service providers. The PUC's current policies related to the electricity procurement process, resource adequacy requirements, and the renewables portfolio standard would not be put into law. The PUC would determine whether and how small electricity customers in existing buildings would be required to have time-differentiated electricity service. New "direct access" for electricity service would continue to be prohibited until 2015, after which time it would be allowed.

**ARGUMENTS**

**PRO**

Vote YES to make sure we NEVER AGAIN face the blackouts and market manipulation caused by deregulation. Proposition 80 guarantees a stable and reliable electric system with ample supplies of clean, affordable power and increased use of renewable resources. Vote YES for lower rates, environmental protection, and no more deregulation.

**CON**

Proposition 80 is a high-risk, anticonsumer, anti-environmental approach to California's energy future. It limits green energy from solar and geothermal resources. This confusing measure won't lower electric bills, won't prevent blackouts, and eliminates consumer choice. Complex energy policy should be developed with public hearings, not through the initiative process.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

**FOR**

Mindy Spatt  
The Utility Reform  
Network (TURN)  
711 Van Ness Avenue,  
Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 929-8876  
[info@yesonproposition80.com](mailto:info@yesonproposition80.com)  
[www.yesonproposition80.com](http://www.yesonproposition80.com)

**AGAINST**

Bob Pence  
Californians for  
Reliable Electricity  
1717 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 551-2513  
[www.noprop80.com](http://www.noprop80.com)